sep 2. filed under CIA, Rockefeller Com. file

Dear Len, 6/29/76

What follows is something I once started to talk to you about but never finished.

I'm sorry I didn't think of it earlier, when I first got up, because soon I'll have to take -il grocery shopping, then there will be the mail and then the work for an FOIA suit I started 10 days ago and had to lay aside for other to do emergency work on other cases. There has been no writing for about six weeks, that many other needs. This also means my advance apologies for typos I won't have time to correct.

For some time I've been sitting on a series of I think important stories on the JFK assassination. I haven't had much choice. While for the most part I'm willing to give them away, there today are few takers. This within my experience is the state of the press today.

The one thing certain to cause identification as an odd-ball is a genuine concern for the state of the country, its institutions and the press as an institution.

I don't recommend your taking the time to read the Schweiker report, which is as Orwellian an operation as I've seen since the Warren Report itself, but if you have a copy, read the first paragraph under the first italicized item subhead on the first page and ask yourself how come you saw nothing about that totally disqualifying limitation in any news account. I think it makes all that follows irrelevant as in fact, save within narrow confines not even suggested, it is - totally irrelevant. I can go into this is anyone has any interest. I've annotated a copy of the report for the future, not likely for my own writing.

The major-media attitude has reduced me to making attempts with the Enquirer. Pope is a mad genius. In the area of his own original developments he has been remarkable. In solid news he is crazy. Once I sold them a major story that was without possibility of libel or any other problems. You know me and documents. They had 'em. But they sent a really fine reporter here to check that one story out for three days. *hie is enough to eliminate any possibility of profit for a story for which the pay is good. However, I've had no real choice, and their record on news judgement, if that is the factor, is incredibly bad. I gave them the documentary leads on the CIA and mind-toying with drugs several years before it broke. They did not see it. I've been trying to get back the secret records on the testing of the shots made on Oswald. They prove he did not fire a rifle. Despite the Enquirer's record of specializing in simplicity, they get something like this and they complicate it out of their own comprehension.

The people I've been dealing with are friends and good reporters. Pope is just a dictator not trusting anyone else's news judgement. He may have a few political hangups.

About two months ago, maybe a little less, they sent one of their best men up. It was when there was the leak from the Schweiker operation that the agencies had withheld evidence from the Warren Commission. Well, I've plenty of that. So I thought of one that should have been sure-fire and with any attention should break the whole thing wide open. Their man, now free-lancing but one of their former top editors recently retired, went for it big. Since then they've been sitting and thinking of crazy things to do. That particular editor had a day of Friday, a reporter friend sat in his slot, phoned me and told me they had mixed it. He said he'd talk about it more because he saw it as a major story. Yesterday he could add nothing but said he'd try the approach I suggested to begin with, very simple.

What makes it all crazier still is that they obtained the one thing that could be helpful on their own in the first thing they did.

What I'm talking about is proof positive that all the agencies knew at the very beginning that the official account of the assassination was false, proof that it was beyond the capability of any one man, meaning conspiracy, and continuing suppression of it with an added twist, CIA spooking.

You should recall this as the official account of the shootings: The first or "magic" bullet struck the President in the back of the neck, transmitted it and then inflicted five non-fatal wounds on Connally. The second missed entirely, struck a curbstone and a spray of concrete wounded a bystander a block away. The third blew the head open. And this is all the shooting.

You probably don't know that the records indicate the CIA never saw the Zaprudar film, the basis one of the assassination. They asked for a copy after the end of the Commission's life. I got Hoover's letter asking Rankin what to do and published it in my third book. The ostensible purpose was "training." Naturally my footnotes ask whether for training assassins or teaching them how not to be caught.

Now I have those CIA records not earlier purged. They had the National Photographic Interpretation Center, their operation and we're told the world's best, study this film. What the Enquirer's checking with CIA established is when: within the first two days. And as of today this is unpublished, as are the results of that professional study:

The first bullet hit Kennedy in the throat, not theback of the neck.
The second one hit Connally.
The third was fatal, to the head.

The film cannot, of course, show missed shots.

By itself this is totally destructive of the official account. People have become insensitive, but I never forget this was the account of the killing of a President, with all that means.

The photo studies are further destructive in saying the first shot was much earlierm, at a time when it could not have been by Oswald or from that window.

Of all those who have suppressed this, beginning with the CIA by 11/24/64, the day Oswald was killed, the two most recent are the Rockefeller Commission and the Church/Schweiker committee. I have the papers the CIA gave both. They are in this form:

A typed covering letter to Olson on the Rockefeller Commission explaining the limited enclosures. Naturally on something as utterly inconsequential as the assassination of a President they did not take special pains with their files. So they can find no typed analyses, reports, etc. Only they did find these few pages of handwritten notations.

However, they could not be more explicit, more definitive. They say more than the simplification I think is by any standard a major story, more so today with the overtones I'm not mentioning to keep it simple.

To me it is gruesome that a decade after the crime we have a Presidential commission appointed by the man who failed his 1964 responsibility, in charge of his then associate, they elect to go into this aspect and totally suppress such evidence; and then a Senate subcommittee run by a man the same President's son took may be a possible vice-presidential selectee, the Senate is supposed to investigate these intelligence sins and it, too, suppresses the same evidence - without which it could not have written the report that issued. And separately if there is interest what that accomplishes. Let's keep it simple.

The papers have this thing that they do not buy information or pay non-staffers. They pay wire-services, janitors, secretaries and others but have this excuse for not doing what generally they just don't want to do.And I have this thing of having no regular income and considerable expenses in developing this kind of evidence. I also have an opinion of the wealthy elements of the press who will do nothing to help bring hard news to light and then take it from me.

After your first Invaders story I wrote Ken Brief, you may remember. The lack of response does not encourage me to believe your people will go for this. But I'd like to know before I turn elsewhere. And much as this cost they don't have to pay me. Instead they can make a contribution to meet unsupported FOIA expenses, for work that will be